



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,533	07/26/2006	Alexey Vitalievich Ryzhykh	42P24165	9662

7590 02/17/2010
Blakely sokoloff Taylor & Zafman
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
7th Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER

NICKERSON, JEFFREY L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2442

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

02/17/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/587,533	Applicant(s) RYZHYKH, ALEXEY VITALIEVICH	
	Examiner JEFFREY NICKERSON	Art Unit 2442	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 November 2009.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 17-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 and 17-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to Application No. 10/587,533 filed nationally on 26 July 2006 and internationally on 31 May 2006. The request for continued examination presented on 11 November 2009, which amends claims 1-2, 5-9, 11-12, 15, and 20, adds claim 21, cancels claim 16, amends the specification, and presents arguments, is hereby acknowledged. Claims 1-15 and 17-21 are currently pending and have been examined.

Specification

2. Applicant's response filed on 11 November 2009 providing change to the specific is noted. All outstanding objections to the specification are hereby withdrawn.

Claim Objections

3. Applicant's response filed 11 November 2009 providing change the claims is noted. All outstanding objections to the claims are hereby withdrawn. However, new objections may appear below.

4. Claims 1-7 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 because of a minor grammatical error.

Art Unit: 2442

Regarding claim 1, this claims recites "wherein a second larger RDMA buffer is not..." in stanza 5. The phrase "a second larger" should be "the first larger" and will be treated as such for purposes of further examination. Correction is required.

Regarding claims 2-7, these claims inherit the objections of their parent claim(s).

35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments, filed in the response dated 11 November 2009, with respect to the rejection(s) under 35 USC 103(a) have been fully considered and are at least persuasive-in-part. Therefore, these rejections have been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, new grounds of rejection may appear below.

Claim Rejections

7. Claims 1-15, 17-19, and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Creemer (US 6,014,727); and in further view of Lee (US

Art Unit: 2442

2006/0227799 A1), Culley ("Marker PDU Aligned Framing for TCP Specification", 27 September 2005), and Eydelman (US 2005/0071451 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Creemer teaches a method comprising:

pre-allocating each of a plurality of buffers to a different connection of a plurality of connections (Creemer: abstract; Figures 2-3; col 2, lines 1-20);

determining that an allocated buffer of the plurality, which has been allocated for a given connection, has insufficient size to transfer data (Creemer: Figure 3; col 2, lines 29-60; col 5, lines 35-52; col 6, lines 43-51);

provisioning and allocating a larger buffer for the given connection, wherein the larger buffer is not provisioned and allocated for another connection of the plurality, and wherein a size of the larger buffer is larger than a size of the pre-allocated buffer (Creemer: Figures 2-4; col 2, lines 29-60; col 5, lines 35-52; col 6, lines 43-51).

Creemer does not teach wherein the buffer is a pre-registered RDMA buffer;

transferring the data to a network using the buffer;

sending a control message indicating a first larger RDMA buffer is to be provisioned for the given connection and that a receiving node is to provision a larger RDMA buffer;

receiving an acknowledgement message from a network corresponding to the control message, the acknowledgement message including information associated with communication with the larger RDMA buffer of the receiving node.

Art Unit: 2442

Lee, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches wherein the buffer is a pre-registered RDMA buffer (Lee: [0003]) and wherein buffers are RDMA buffers (Lee: [0003]); and transferring the data to a network using the buffer (Lee: [0003]).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Lee for using an RDMA system. The teachings of Lee, when implemented with the Creemer system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to adjust buffer sizes as needed, in an RDMA environment. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Lee with the Creemer system in order to apply the buffer technique to commonly used networking environments.

The Creemer/Lee system does not teach sending a control message indicating a first buffer is to be provisioned for the given connection and that a receiving node is to provision a larger buffer;

receiving an acknowledgement message from a network corresponding to the control message, the acknowledgement message including information associated with communication with the larger buffer of the receiving node.

Culley, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches sending a control message with commands about an RDMA connection (Culley: pg 31-35, see "Startup Phase", provides exchanging private data for connection setup; Specifically the MPA Request; See also pg 34, section 6.1.2; See pg 37 #6 for description of "private data"); and

receiving an acknowledgement from the network corresponding to the control message, the acknowledgment message including information associated with the

Art Unit: 2442

communication of the receiving node (Culley: pg 31-34, specifically the MPA Reply; See also pg 34-35 section 6.1.2 step 2 provides for replying with private data; See pg 37 #6 for description of "private data").

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Culley for using an control handshaking for setting up connection parameters. The teachings of Culley, when implemented with the Creemer/Lee system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to handshake control information to adjust connection parameters in an RDMA environment. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Culley with the Creemer/Lee system in order to allow the initiator/target to dynamically customize connection parameters based on their needs.

The Creemer/Lee/Culley system does not teach wherein the control message is indicating a first buffer is to be provisioned for the given connection and that a receiving node is to provision a larger buffer; or

wherein the communication is with the larger buffer.

Eydelman, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches wherein the control message is indicating a first buffer is to be provisioned for the given connection and that a receiving node is to provision a larger buffer (Eydelman: [0041]);

receiving an acknowledgement message from a network corresponding to the control message, the acknowledgement message including information associated with communication with the larger buffer of the receiving node (Eydelman: [0041]).

Art Unit: 2442

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Eydelman for allowing to sender to instruct the receiver to increase its buffer size and have a corresponding acknowledgement. The teachings of Eydelman, when implemented with the Creemer/Lee/Culley system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to handshake buffer size adjustment instructions in an RDMA environment. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to utilize the teachings of Eydelman with the Creemer/Lee/Culley system in order to allow the initiator/target to dynamically instruct the adjustment of buffer sizes based on their needs.

Regarding claim 2, the Creemer/Lee/Culley/Eydelman system teaches prior to said transferring, receiving the acknowledgement message indicating that the receiving node has provisioned the larger RDMA buffer, wherein the information includes an address of the larger RDMA buffer of the receiving node and a remote key (Eydelman: [0041] for returning newly provisioned buffer information; Lee: [0021] for address; Culley: pg 33, Key field for key).

Regarding claim 3, the Creemer/Lee/Culley/Eydelman system teaches wherein said determining comprises comparing a size of the data to a predetermined threshold (Creemer: col 7, lines 17-24).

Art Unit: 2442

Regarding claim 4, the Creemer/Lee/Culley/Eydelman system teaches further comprising comparing sizes of a plurality of elements of an input-output vector (incoming packet stream) to the predetermined threshold (Creemer: col 7, lines 17-24 provides that the data stream for that specific connection is compared to the buffer threshold size for the small buffer; Lee: Figure 5A for outgoing buffer queue).

Regarding claim 5, the Creemer/Lee/Culley/Eydelman system teaches wherein said provisioning comprises allocating and registering the first larger RDMA buffer during a communication phase (Creemer: col 6, lines 30-42 for larger buffer; Lee: [0003]-[0004] for allocating and registering during communication).

Regarding claim 6, the Creemer/Lee/Culley/Eydelman system teaches further comprising:

- unregistering the pre-registered RDMA buffer (Lee: [0025]); and
- freeing memory used by the pre-registered RDMA buffer (Lee: [0025]).

Regarding claim 7, the Creemer/Lee/Culley/Eydelman system teaches wherein said transferring comprises:

- copying data from a source to the first larger RDMA buffer (Lee: Figure 5A, [0036], [0083]-[0086]); and
- performing an RDMA transfer from the larger RDMA buffer to the network (Lee: Figure 5A; [0085]-[0087]).

Regarding claim 8, this article of manufacture claim contains limitations found within claims 1, 3, and 5, and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

Regarding claim 9, this article of manufacture claim contains limitations found within claim 2, and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

Regarding claim 10, this article of manufacture claim contains limitations found within in claim 7, and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

Regarding claim 11, this system claim contains limitations found within that of claim 1 and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable; and further comprising:

- an interconnect (Creemer: Figure 1);

- one or more processors coupled with the interconnect (Creemer: Figure 1; Figure 6; col 9, lines 31-60);

- a memory coupled with the interconnect to store data (Creemer: col 5, lines 52-67);

- a network interface device coupled with the interconnect to transfer data to a network by using an Ethernet protocol (Creemer: Figure 6, item 812; col 10, lines 1-8; Eydelman: [0003] provides for Ethernet use).

Art Unit: 2442

Regarding claim 12, this system claim contains limitations found within that of claims 1 and 2, and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

Regarding claim 13, this system claim contains limitations found within claims 3, 5, and 7, and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

Regarding claim 14, the Creemer/Lee/Culley/Eydelman system teaches wherein the pre-registered RDMA buffer has a size ranging from 100 to 2000 bytes (Creemer: col 9, lines 9-17); and

wherein the provisioned RDMA buffer has a size ranging from 1000 to 200,000 bytes (Creemer: col 9, lines 18-30).

Regarding claim 15, this method claim contains limitations found within that of claims 1 and 2, and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

Regarding claim 17, this method claim contains limitations found within that of claim 5, and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

Regarding claim 18, this method claim contains limitations found within that of claim 6, and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

Art Unit: 2442

Regarding claim 19, this method claim contains limitations found within that of claim 7, and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

Regarding claim 21, this method claim contains limitations found within that of claim 2, and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

8. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Creemer (US 6,014,727); in view of Lee (US 2006/0227799 A1), Culley ("Marker PDU Aligned Framing for TCP Specification", 27 September 2005), and Eydelman (US 2005/0071451 A1); and in further view of Kahle et al (US 6,725,354 B1).

Regarding claim 20, this method claim contains limitations found within claim 11, and the same rationale of rejection is used, where applicable.

The Creemer/Lee/Culley/Eydelman system fails to teach a processor having multiple cores.

Kahle, in a similar field of endeavor, teaches a processor having multiple cores (Kahle: abstract).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Kahle for having multi-core processors. The teachings of Kahle, when implemented with the Creemer/Lee/Culley/Eydelman system, will allow one of ordinary skill in the art to use multi-core processors in a dynamic buffer adjusting RDMA environment. One of ordinary skill in the art would be

Art Unit: 2442

motivated to utilize the teachings of Kahle with the Creemer/Lee/Culley/Eydelman system in order to increase overall processing capabilities.

Citation of Pertinent Prior Art

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a. Blackmore et al (US 7,089,289 B1) discloses a RDMA system with buffer size management.
- b. James et al (US 6,006,289) discloses an RDMA system where the initiator handshakes receiver buffer size requirements with the target prior to transfer.
- c. Siddabathuni (US 2004/0024833 A1) discloses a system that performs local buffer resizing based on needs.
- d. Slutz et al (US 6,601,119 B1) discloses an RDMA system where the initiator can issue commands to the target for configuring the target.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JEFFREY NICKERSON whose telephone number is (571)270-3631. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th, 9:00am - 7:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Saleh Najjar can be reached on (571)272-4006. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. N./
Examiner, Art Unit 2442

**/Asad M Nawaz/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2455**